REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed November 28, 2007.

Claims 1-66 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-66.

The present Response amends claims 1, 18, 22-24, 34, and 50 and adds new claim 68, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-66, and 68. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

A. Claims Rejections - 35 USC § 102 & 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-13, 17, 22, 24, 34, 39, 41-45, 49, 50, 51, 53, 58, 59, 60-62, and 66 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Geary (Graphic Java).

Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19-21, 25-29, 33, 35-38, 54, 55, 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary in view of Schildt (Java 2, The Complete Reference).

Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary in view of Schildt and further in view of Zalka (US 2004/0056894 A1).

Claims 14, 15, 16, 46-48, 63, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary in view of Zalka (US 2004/0056894 A1).

Here, independent claim 1 is amended to further define that "*the set of objects includes at least one of: one or more booklets wherein anyone of the one or more booklets represents a set of pages linked by a page navigator having a user selectable graphical representation and is capable of containing other booklets; and one or more portlets wherein anyone of the one or more portlets is a self-contained application that renders its own GUI.*"

Applicant respectfully submits that Booklets and Portlets are special type of control objects which are distinct from general JAVA Swing components *JFrame* and *JApplet* as disclosed in Geary. Hence, Geary does not teach organizing a set of objects including at least one of one or more booklets or portlets into a logical hierarchy, even assuming Geary discloses organizing general GUI components such as *JFrame* and *JApplet* into a class hierarchy.

Therefore, independent claim 1 should be in allowable condition. Hence, dependent claim 2-17 and 68 which are based on allowable independent claim 1 should all be in allowable condition.

Furthermore, independent claims 18, 34, and 50 are similarly amended as claim 1. Therefore, independent claims 18, 34, and 50 should all be in allowable condition, at least for the same reason as stated above. Hence, dependent claims 19-33 which are based on allowable independent claim 18; dependent claims 35-49 which are based on allowable independent claims 34; and dependent claims 51-66 which are based on allowable independent claim 50 should all be in allowable condition.

B. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 26, 2008   By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
                                    Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                    Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800